Dear Harold, 8/3/71

I've just received your latest mailing and have time to respond. I'd like to make immediate response anyway.

I'm very glad to hear that you have been recognized as a pauper, thus can proceed with your appeal in the clothing suit. I would imagine that one of the major obstacles now is getting a good/honest lawyer.

PM III: A letter of yours to me, Paul and others asks, basically, for any help any can offer. Much of the contents of PM are out of my mind now, but I do recall having sent several notes on PM III as I read it. You said you'd file them for when you return to work on the PM's so I presume you have them now. As you say, much will jave to be deleted because of developments since, etc. This is especially true of PM I. However, I am not sure exactly what you plan in this regrad, ie., if you want to consolidate the three books on your own or have the publisher do that.

I am a little taken back by your reaction to my letter offer constructive criticism in writing the new PM. You say that I have said "we are wasting our time," and that agreeing with my letter would persuade you to quit. This is not what I meant to say, if that was the impression you got. I said that in terms of a historical record, I can well understand your returning to work on PM. But realisitically, I am very skeptical that there will be any <u>immediate</u> interest. This, of course, will depend on the focus in which you treat the material. Approached from the perspective of government duplicity and complicity, there is a much better chance. Approached from the perspective of more details about the wounds, a new understanding of how many gunman shot at JFK, I really think the public could care less. This is not to say it is not important or that I do not think it is important. I'm merely giving you my assessment of the public mood. I may be wrong.

I'm sorry that you find my suggestions academic and lacking a solution for I make them explicitly thinking that this was at least the prospect of a solution. Really, Harold. What is academic about telling you to make sure that whatever points you are getting at are made crystal clear, no or minimal beating around the bush, as you have a tendency to do? Or telling you to establish a focus, which again should be made clear? Or to make the relationships you see clear enough so that people who do not think like you will also see them? To me these are all suggestions which are entirely "feasible."

It is indeed unfortunate that you have been burned on several promises and offers to edit you work. That does not change the fact that much of it needs <u>good</u> editing. Frame-up may have gotten professional editing, but it certainly did not get <u>good</u> editing. That is not your fault. But to me it is a tragedy, no matter whose fault it is, that the final product is so flawed. I am half-way through F-U and while I've simply been awed by the facts and on occasion by their presentation, there have been times when the presentation was virtually incomprehensible. I've spoken to many others with the same feelings. I think some of the reviews suggest this as well.

You don't have to tell me you are not writing to entertain or for enjoyment. But do I have to tell you that publishers will be reluctant

to publish and readers reluctant to read something which they must constantly labor to figure out? You simply have to write in a way that can be understood.

You indicate your fan mail shows your readers understand what you are saying. I can see this for WW, which I consider about your best written wprk. As I recall from one reading, O in NO was very readable. I am inclined to agree with Dick on WW II, that it is more a collection of "newsletters" than a continuous, coherent book. I think Photo WW had writing flaws. The later works seem the most flawed, the hardest to understand, and I imagine you couldn't have gotten much public reaction to them.

If you want some concrete suggestions, then I urge you to re-read my 7/26 carefully and pay heed to what I say about the way you think and how it affects your writing. Never forget that you are writing for people who do not look at things as you do, do not have the smame powers of analysis. This applies more to what you are writing now than to the earlier things, which were much broader and had a much wider and thus more apparent focus and meaning. Also, I seem to recall that you have a very anxious editor at your disposal. You are married to her. And she happens to be one of your sharpest, most devoted and most honest critics. Listen to what she says. Just from when I was there and the three of us went over drafts of Agent O, I almost always found myself in agreement with Lil.

I just read over your letter to me and others in which, besides soliciting aid, you describe the order of the book as you plan it. That is fine and good, and since I am familiar with what you propose for each chapter, I can imagine the nature of the material you will treat. However, you letter gives no indication of the focus in which you intend to handle it or the point or points to which all of this will be directed. I ask that you tell me this, as specifically as you can. If you cannot, then I do not know how you could possibly begin writing the book. I can think of several focuses for you, some more apparent than others. Which one or ones you have in mind I do not know, and that you must be able to tell me and your readers. Perhaps thinking about this will help your organization and your writing.

You ask for a scale of values. I have one, emphasizing negative values. The really important things are the Burkley papers, the clothing pix, other SS documents, etc., and in no particular order. But the least important and most detrimental things are, as you describe, "needless attacks on Vince and JG," your role at the Shaw trial, your fight with the government, your successes. You must be careful not to make the book seem like a glorification or a defense of Harold Weisberg and a condemnation of all those who are his enemies. You are entitled to proper credit. But my instinct is that a littel modesty will get you further than an inflated ego. Emphasize the factual issues, which include both technical matters and matters involving the duplicity of the government.

You mention that you'd welcome things others have for you to use. As far as I'm concerned now, the best thing I can direct you to is my book, which is almost all on the medical evidence, in the context of LHO innocence. I would be willing to let you use almost anything of mine with credit, except Fillinger with whom I expect problems. I have often taken from your works with credit. I don't have a copy to circulate now, but Sylvia has one which she has finished. If you want to

and gov't conspiracy

want to borrow it, then call Sylvia collect and ask her to send it to you. (her summer number is 516--583-5246) Or you can tell me and I'll ask her to send it.

You mention a note of mine you found and request loan of my "clear 8 x 10 of CE889." This must be an error. I have clear copies of CE's 891, 895, and 902. From the context in which you mention this picture, I assume you want it to show the position of the back wound marked on stand-in. I think these are not very good for that purpose. Much better would be the UPI pix taken from the street close-up during reconstrc. Widely published, to my specific recollection, you can find in Bantam ed. of warren Report, if you have.

You had another note on Biship and Burkley. Will write seperately for your convenience.

Please take my remarks constructively. I do wish there were more I could do than make suggestions. Perhaps I could read whatever drafts you have before I return to school and help you out with those, really taking them apart, if that is required. I would be willing to come down for a few days to do that if you wished. I'd simply do nothing but that, if it would help.

Best,
Howard